

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed February 23, 2009. Prior to the Office Action mailed February 23, 2009, Claims 1-11 were pending in the application. The present Response cancels Claims 1-11; and adds new Claims 12-31, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 12-31. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Objections

In the Office Action, Claim 8 was objected to because of informalities. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 8 has been canceled. Accordingly, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 4 has been canceled. Accordingly, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

II. Specification Objections

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to as failing to define the terminology "XA" and update related cross references. Applicant respectfully submits that the specification has been amended to satisfy the Examiner's requirement. Accordingly, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particular point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Claims 1-2 have been canceled. Accordingly, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that

the Claims 1-2, 4-11 have been canceled. Accordingly, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 & 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-7, 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kamath et al. (U.S. 6,754,696) (hereinafter Kamath).

In the Office Action, Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamath et al. (U.S. 6,754,696) (hereinafter Kamath), in view of Verma (U.S. 6,856,993) (hereinafter Verma).

In the Office Action, Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamath et al. (U.S. 6,754,696) (hereinafter Kamath), in view of Comeau (U.S. 2001/0049726) (hereinafter Comeau).

Claim 12

Claim 12 states the feature “*wherein each resource object is wrapped with a wrapper object, wherein the transaction manager uses the wrapper object to synchronize concurrent enlistment requests.*”

Applicant also respectfully submits that Kamath and other prior art do not teach the above feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 12, as added, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 22 and 31

Claims 22 and 31, while independently patentable, recite limitations that similarly to Claim 12 are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-21 and 23-30

Claims 13-21 and 23-30 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 21, 2009

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Fax: (415) 362-2928